

**REMARKS**

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the application. The Official Action dated April 20, 2004 has been received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the present application, claim 1 has been amended and claims 1-20 are currently pending.

The Official Action rejected claims 1-3, 6 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0070212 to *Choi et al.* (hereinafter "*Choi*") in view of JP 4-39524 to *Ishikawa* (hereinafter "*Ishikawa*") or U.S. Patent No. 3,086,511 to *Loch* (hereinafter "*Loch*"). The rejection of claims 1-3, 6 and 7 is traversed and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

As required in Chapter 2143.03 of the M.P.E.P., in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all of the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." As amended, claim 1 is allowable over the cited references in that claim 1 recites a microwave oven with a toaster comprising, among other features, a door lock which is operatively associated with a power source.

None of the cited references, namely *Choi*, *Ishikawa*, nor *Loch*, either singularly or in combination, suggest all of the features of the claimed invention. As correctly pointed out in the Official Action, *Choi* does not show a door lock for holding a toaster door. See page 2 of the Official Action. With regard to *Ishikawa*, contrary to the assertion in the Official Action, nowhere does *Ishikawa* disclose or even suggest a door lock for a toaster. *Loch*, on the other hand, does disclose a door lock, but it does not disclose a door lock operatively associated with a power source. At best, *Loch* discloses a "latch releasing mechanism [which] is either manually operable or automatically operable, under the control of a heat responsive device 48." See

column 3, lines 66-72. For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of *Choi*, *Ishikawa*, and *Loch*, does not disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 as required under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn. Claims 2, 3, 6 and 7, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable for at least the same reasons.

In addition, the Official Action rejected claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2003/0042252 to *Back et al.* (hereinafter “*Back*”) in view of *Ishikawa*. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. In particular, the present application and *Back* were, at the time of the invention of the present application, made and owned by LG. Philips LCD Co., Ltd. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn as *Back* is not valid prior art.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

The Applicant hereby authorizes the Commissioner of Patents to charge any fees necessary to complete this filing, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, or credit any overpayment in fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the necessary extension of time.

Dated: July 28, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark R. Kresloff

Registration No.: 42,766

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant